

### REMARKS

Claims 25-29 remain pending in this application and are presented for reconsideration. Claims 25, 27, and 28 are amended without any intent of disclaiming equivalents thereof.

Support for amendments to claims 25 and 28 can be found throughout the Specification, for example, at paragraph 13 on page 4. Support for amendments to claim 27 can be found throughout the Specification, for example, at paragraphs 43 and 44 on page 17. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

#### Claim objections

Claim 27 stands rejected under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form, and specifically, for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants have amended claim 27 to depend from claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim rejection over claim 27 has been overcome through the amendment, and respectfully request the withdrawal of all the objections.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claim 27 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Office action questions support for the “logic” limitation recited on line 2 of claim 27.

Applicants have amended claim 27 to amend all recitations of “logic” to “computer logic.” Claim 27 has also been amended to recite relationships between various computer logic elements, the controller and the actuator. Support for amendments to claim 27 can be found throughout the Specification, for example, at paragraphs 43 and 44 on page 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all the rejections over claim 27 have been overcome, and respectfully request the withdrawal of all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Specifically, the Office action questions whether certain elements are inferentially claimed.

Applicants have amended claim 28 to address questions posed by the Office action. Specifically, Applicants do not wish to claim either a web or a transporting roller; instead, claim 28 is directed towards structural means that work in conjunction with a web and a transporting roller. Claim 29 depends from amended claim 28 and, therefore, includes all the limitations of amended claim 28. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections over claims 28 and 29 have been overcome, and respectfully request the withdrawal of all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 25, 26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,342 to Kawabe *et al.* (hereinafter "Kawabe").

Kawabe describes how to spread out multiple filaments previously in a bundle by blowing air over the bundle, which is itself disposed over a suction cavity 4 (col. 5, lns. 20-24; col. 7, lns. 14-23). Kawabe does not teach or suggest a pressure sensor, a tension sensor, or a web tensioning roller as recited in claim 25. Nor does Kawabe teach or suggest means for measuring ambient pressure, means for measuring web tension pressure, or means for adjusting web tension pressure as recited in claim 28. The Office action's characterization of structures 44, 33, and 31 in Kawabe as a pressure sensor, a tension sensor, and a web tensioning roller, respectively, is misplaced.

First, Kawabe's structure 44 is a "bending sensor" that "constantly measures the bending amount of the multi-filament (F) passing through said suction cavity..." (col. 8, lns. 7-17). The amount of web bending is not necessarily correlated with either a pressure measurement or the

tension in the web. As shown by a top view in Fig. 3, structure 44 does not contact the web, which needs to be suspended freely in the suction cavity in order to be separated. Therefore, there is no description or suggestion that structure 44 senses ambient pressure or web tension. Second, structure 33 is a servo motor and not a tension sensor (col. 7, lns. 45-48). Third, Kawabe's structure 31 is a top roller that, while exerting "squeezing pressure" in conjunction with a bottom roller (col. 7, lns. 57-62), is not capable of adjusting the web tension pressure as recited in amended claim 25. For similar reasons, none of Kawabe's embodiments teaches or suggests the elements recited in amended claim 28 either.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections over claims 25, its dependent claim 26, and claim 28, and respectfully request the withdrawal of all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 25-29 are allowable. Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment and Response, reconsideration, and early favorable action by the Examiner.

The Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below to discuss any outstanding issues.

Date: January 19, 2005  
Reg. No. (Limited Recognition)  
(attached)

Tel. No.: (617) 248-7808  
Fax No.: (617) 248-7100

THT\465\166.3167010\_1

Respectfully submitted,



Duan Wu  
Attorney for Applicants  
Testa, Hurwitz, & Thibeault, LLP  
High Street Tower  
125 High Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110